

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/517,364	03/02/2000	B. Scott Fabre	SLA0153:FCO	5185
26790	7590 01/04/2005		EXAMINER	
LAW OFFICE PMB 1020	CE OF KAREN DANA	DONAGHUE, LARRY D		
15450 SW BOONES FERRY ROAD #9 LAKE OSWEGO, OR 97035			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2154	

DATE MAILED: 01/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application N .	Applicant(s)			
Office Acti n Summary		09/517,364	FABRE, B. SCO	тт		
		Examin r	Art Unit			
		Larry D Donaghue	2154			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication Reply	on appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence ac	ddress		
THE I - Exter after - If the - If NO - Failur Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR I MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT isions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communical period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) day period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory the to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, be eply received by the Office later than three months after the department adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	CION. CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a tion. s, a reply within the statutory minimum of thin or period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON y statute, cause the application to become Al	reply be timely filed rty (30) days will be considered time NTHS from the mailing date of this of BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status		•				
- 1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed or	14 June 2004.				
• _	•	This action is non-final.				
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disp siti	on of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application of the above claim(s) is/are with the above claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction	ithdrawn from consideration.				
Applicati	on Papers					
9)□ .	The specification is objected to by the Ex	aminer.				
10)[10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the The oath or declaration is objected to by	·				
Priority u	inder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents of the priority documents. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International Elee the attached detailed Office action for	uments have been received. uments have been received in A e priority documents have beer Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No received in this National	I Stage		
Attachment		_				
2) Notice 3) Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-9 nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/ · No(s)/Mail Date	48) Paper No(Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PT 	O-152)		

- 1. Claims 1-24 are presented for examination.
- 2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

- 3. Claim 5 recites the limitation "specifically associated with " in step (a). There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
- 4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 5. Claims 1,2,3,6, 9,10,12,13, 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Stevenson et al. 6,819,455.

Stevenson et al. taught the invention (claim 1,2 and 21) as claimed including a method for executing a request to print said "print portion" (col. 3, lines 26-35); generating a "print portion" uniqueness identifier in a host computer, said "print portion" uniqueness identifier specifically referring to and for identifying said "print portion" (col. 3, lines 36-50); comparing said "print portion" uniqueness identifier to a list of

uniqueness identifiers stored in memory (col. 1, lines 62-67, col. 3, lines 52-64); printing said "print portion" using previously rendered data stored in a memory location referenced by said list of uniqueness identifiers if said "print portion" uniqueness identifier is found in said list of uniqueness identifiers (col. 3, lines 52-64); and storing said "print portion" uniqueness identifier and a reference to data stored in memory pertaining to said "print portion" in said list of uniqueness identifiers if said "print portion" uniqueness identifier is not found in said list of uniqueness identifiers (col. 4, lines 12-25).

- 6. As to claim 3, Stevenson et al. taught printing said "print portion" printing an entire print job (col. 3, lines 52-64).
- 7. As to claim 6, Stevenson et al. taught performing an efficiency check (col. 4, lines 51-64). Determining that the proper files is used improves the overall efficiency of the system.
- 8. As to claims 9, 12, and 22, Stevenson et al. taught comparing said "print portion" uniqueness identifier to a list of uniqueness identifiers stored in memory further comprising the step of comparing said "print portion" uniqueness identifier to a list of uniqueness identifiers stored in memory in a printer (col. 3, lines 37-50).
- 9. As to claim 10,13, and 23, Stevenson et al. taught transferring said "print portion" uniqueness identifier from said host computer to said printer (col. 3, lines 37-50).
- 10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

- 11. Claims 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, 14, 15-20, and 24 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stevenson et al. (6,819,455) as applied to claims 1,2,3,6, 9,10, 12,13, 21-23 above, and further in view of Mastie et al. (6,498,656).
- 12. As to claims 11, 14 and 24, Stevenson et al. did not teach transferring all or part of said "print portion" from said host computer to said printer if said "print portion" uniqueness identifier is not found in said list of uniqueness identifiers. Mastie et al. suggest the modification as it would reduce network traffic (col. 6, line 49- col. 7, line 11).
- 13. As to claims 4, 5, 7, 8, and 15-20, Stevenson et al. did not expressly teach taught printing said "print portion" printing a portion of an entire print job. Mastie et al. suggest the modification, segmenting print jobs into multiple files (col. 6, lines 49-57).
- 14. Claims 5 and 7 are multiple file version of claims 1,2,and 21 are rejected for the reason set forth in the rejections set forth in the rejection of claims 4 and 1,2, and 21.
- 15. Claim 8 is multiple file version of claim 6 and is rejected for the reason set forth in the rejections set forth in the rejection of claims 4 and 6.
- 16. Claims 15 and 18 are multiple file version of claims 9, 12 and 22 and are rejected for the reason set forth in the rejections set forth in the rejection of claims 4 and 9,12 and 22.
- 17. Claims 16 and 19 are multiple file version of claims 10, 13 and 23 and are rejected for the reason set forth in the rejections set forth in the rejection of claims 4 and 10,13 and 23.
- 18. Claims 16 and 20 are multiple file version of claims 11, 14 and 24 and are rejected for the reason set forth in the rejections set forth in the rejection of claims 4 and 11,13 and 24.

- 19. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
- 20. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Mastie et al. 6,373,585

Mastie et al. 6,515,756

Mastie et al. 6,145,031

Speed 5,592,593

21. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

22. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Larry D Donaghue whose telephone number is 571-272-3962. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on 571-272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

